

REMARKS

Claims 1, 18, 29, 34, 43, 46, 53, and 57 are currently amended. Claims 9-10, 17, 20, 24-25, 32, 37, 41, 54-56, and 58 were previously canceled without prejudice. New claims 61-65 are added. Accordingly, claims 1-8, 11-16, 18-19, 21-23, 26-31, 33-36, 38-40, 42-53, 57, and 59-65 are currently pending.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview with Applicants' representative, Gregory M. Taylor, on January 13, 2010. The amendments to the claims listed above were discussed with the Examiner with respect to the art of record. No agreement was reached.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-8, 18-19, 21-23, 34-36, 42-43, 46-49, 52-53, 57, and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaminski* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,459) in view of *Rogers* (U.S. Patent No. 4,404,685) and *Whitehart* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,200,377). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 now recites that "the aviation-specific output signals comprise navigation signals, communication signals, automatic direction finder signals, and glide slope signals." Independent claims 18, 34, 43, 46, 53, and 57 are also amended to include similar limitations. Support for the amendments to these claims can be found in the application as filed at least on page 7, lines 8-13.

Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references, either alone or in combination, of all the limitations now recited in claims 1, 18, 34, 43, 46, 53, and 57. In particular, there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references that the aviation-specific output signals comprise "navigation signals, communication

signals, automatic direction finder signals, and glide slope signals” as recited in these claims.

The Examiner admits that *Kaminski* does not teach a “plurality of aviation-specific output signals corresponding to a plurality of channels within said frequency band” as recited in claim 1 (and other independent claims). *Rogers* was cited for disclosing NAV/COM aircraft band signals, and allocation of channels. The Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of *Kaminski* based on the teachings of *Rogers* so that the system of *Kaminski* “processes aviation type signals (NAV/COM) that are used by commercial aircrafts using a single A/D converter.” (Office Action, pp. 8-9).

Whitehart was cited for disclosing simultaneous output signals out of a digital signal processor 20 (Fig. 1). The Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of *Kaminski* based on the teachings of *Whitehart* so multiple users or multiple devices receive a plurality of output signals corresponding to a plurality of channels within the frequency band. (Office Action, pp. 9-10).

Nevertheless, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kaminski*, *Rogers*, or *Whitehart* of aviation-specific output signals that include “automatic direction finder signals” and “glide slope signals” as recited in claims 1, 18, 34, 43, 46, 53, and 57. Thus, even if the teachings of the cited references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of these claims are met.

Accordingly, claims 1, 18, 34, 43, 46, 53, and 57 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Since claims 4-8 and 60 depend from claim 1, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 1. Since claims 19 and 21-23 depend from claim 18, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 18. Since claims 35, 36, and 42 depend from claim 34, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 34. Since claims 47-49 and 52 depend from claim 46, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 46.

As a result, the foregoing dependent claims would also not have been obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 4-8, 18-19, 21-23, 34-36, 42-43, 46-49, 52-53, 57, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 14-15, 27, 44-45, and 50-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaminski* in view of *Rogers* and *Whikehart*, and further in view of *Phillips* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,878). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 2-3 and 14-15 depend from claim 1, and thus include the limitations of claim 1. Claim 27 depends from independent claim 18 and thus includes the limitations of claim 18. Claims 44-45 depend from independent claim 43 and thus include the limitations of claim 43. Claims 50-51 depend from independent claim 46 and thus include the limitations of claim 46.

As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kaminski*, *Rogers*, or *Whikehart* of aviation-specific output signals that include “automatic direction finder signals” and “glide slope signals” as recited in claims 1, 18, 43, and 46. The addition of the teachings of *Phillips* does not cure the deficiencies of the other references.

As a result, even if the teaching of the cited reference are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claims 2-3, 14-15, 27, 44-45, and 50-51 are met. Thus, these claims would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-3, 14-15, 27, 44-45, and 50-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 11-13 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaminski* in view of *Rogers* and *Whikehart*, and further in view of *Bugeja* et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0177446). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 11-13 depend from claim 1 and thus include the limitations of claim 1. Claim 26 depends from independent claim 18 and thus includes the limitations of claim 18.

As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kaminski*, *Rogers*, or *Whikehart* of aviation-specific output signals that include “*automatic direction finder signals*” and “*glide slope signals*” as recited in claims 1 and 18. The addition of the teachings of *Bugeja* does not cure the deficiencies of the other references.

As a result, even if the teachings of the cited references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claims 11-13 and 26 are met. Thus, these claims would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11-13 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaminski* in view of *Rogers*, *Whikehart*, *Phillips*, and further in view of *Bugeja*. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 16 depends from claim 1 and thus includes the limitations of claim 1.

As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kaminski*, *Rogers*, or *Whikehart* of aviation-specific output signals that include “*automatic direction finder signals*” and “*glide slope signals*” as recited in claim 1. The addition of the teachings of *Phillips* and *Bugeja* does not cure the deficiencies of the other references.

As a result, even if the teachings of the cited references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claim 16 are met. Thus, claim 16 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 38-40 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kaminski* in view of *Rogers*, *Whikehart*, *Bugeja*, and further in view of *Phillips*. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 38-40 depend from independent claim 34, and thus include the limitations of claim 34. Claim 59 depends from independent claim 57 and thus includes the limitations of claim 57.

As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kaminski*, *Rogers*, or *Whikehart* of aviation-specific output signals that include “automatic direction finder signals” and “glide slope signals” as recited in claims 34 and 57. The addition of the teachings of *Bugeja* and *Phillips* does not cure the deficiencies of the other references.

As a result, even if the teachings of the cited references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claims 38-40 and 59 are met. Thus, claims 38-40 and 59 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 38-40 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 18-19, 21-23, 27-31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kelley* (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,402) in view of *Rogers* and *Kelley* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,280,636). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Like independent claim 18, independent claim 29 now recites that “the aviation-specific output signals comprise navigation signals, communication signals, automatic direction finder signals, and glide slope signals.”

The Examiner admits that *Kelley* ‘402 does not teach a “plurality of aviation-specific radio channels and aviation-specific functions” as recited in independent claims 18 and 29. *Rogers* was cited for disclosing NAV/COM aircraft band signals, and allocation of channels. The Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of *Kelley* ‘402 based on the teachings of *Rogers* so that the system of *Kelley* ‘402 “processes aviation type signals (NAV/COM) that are used by commercial aircrafts.” (Office Action, pp. 22-23).

Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references, either alone or in combination, of all the limitations now recited in claims 18 and 29. In particular, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kelley* ‘402, *Rogers*, or *Kelley* ‘636 that

the aviation-specific output signals comprise “navigation signals, communication signals, *automatic direction finder* signals, and *glide slope* signals” as recited in claims 18 and 29.

Thus, even if the teachings of the cited references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claims 18 and 29 are met. As a result, claims 18 and 29 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Since claims 19, 21-23, and 27-28 depend from claim 18, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 18. Since claims 30-31 and 33 depend from claim 29, these dependent claims include the limitations of claim 29. As a result, the foregoing dependent claims would also not have been obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 18 and 29.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 18-19, 21-23, 27-31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kelley* ‘402 in view of *Rogers*, *Kelley* ‘636, and further in view of *Phillips*. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Since claim 27 depends from independent claim 18, claim 27 includes the limitations of claim 18. As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Kelley* ‘402, *Rogers*, or *Kelley* ‘636 that the aviation-specific output signals comprise “navigation signals, communication signals, *automatic direction finder* signals, and *glide slope* signals” as recited in claim 18. Adding the teachings of *Phillips* does not cure the deficiencies of the other references.

Thus, even if the teachings of the cited references are combined as proposed by the Examiner, not all the limitations of claim 27 are met. As a result, claim 27 would not have been obvious over the cited references.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

New claims 61-65 depend from claim 1 and recite various signal ranges for aircraft navigation signals, aeronautical navigation signals, communication signals, automatic direction finder signals, and glide slope signals. Support for the recited signal ranges in these claims can be found in the application as filed on at least page 7, lines 8-13.

As claims 61-65 depend from claim 1 and include the limitations thereof, claims 61-65 present allowable subject matter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. In addition, there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the cited references of the signal ranges recited in claims 62, 64, and 65.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 13, 2010

/GREGORY M. TAYLOR/

Gregory M. Taylor
Reg. No. 34,263

Attorneys for Applicants
Fogg & Powers LLC
5810 W. 78th Street, Ste. 100
Minneapolis, MN 55439
T – (952) 465-0770
F – (952) 465-0771